

PRG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/304,552	05/04/1999	PETER J. T. VAN RAVENSTEIN	PHN16.914	9833

7590 02/13/2003

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

VO, TUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/304,552	Applicant(s) VAN RAVENSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Tung T. Vo	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 12/02/02 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/304,552 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapp (US5,657,076) in view of Johnson (US 6,175,373).

Re claims 1-6, Tapp teaches a security control system comprises all limitations as set forth in the previous Office Action, Paper No. 16.

Re claims 7-9, Tap further teaches television device (36 of fig. 10) serves to display the captured image from the camera (20-26 of fig. 1) simultaneously, this is interpreted that the camera used to provide to the television device a live image of the event (col. 4, lines 13-21; the captured image within a zone has been transmitted to the television device (36 of fig. 1) of Tap). Moreover, Tap suggests that the PIP as shown in the television display (36 of fig. 1) for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display formats such as split screen

Art Unit: 2613

or quad screen based upon the event, but the PIP of Tap does not not repeatedly display a sequence formed by plurality of images.

However, Johnson teaches the PIP (126 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by a plurality of images from a buffer (131 of fig. 3), where the images of the sequence are provided to the display monitor repeatedly. Therefore, taking the combined teachings of Tap and Johnson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the PIP (126 of fig. 3) of Johnson into the display (36 of fig. 1) of Tap for the same purpose of repeatedly displaying the sequence formed by the plurality images. Doing so would allow the user to view the desired event constant without rewinding the tape or reloading image from a memory and reduce the time and its cost.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that the combination of Tapp and Johnson fails to provide any such suggestion to make obvious the claimed invention, pages 3-5 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tapp teaches the television monitor (36 of fig. 1) that displays multi-video sources that are provided from the cameras as the PIP monitor (PIP of fig. 1) associated with plurality detectors (112, 14, 16, 18 of fig. 1) to trigger the cameras, wherein the monitor display (36) with PIP for displaying plurality of images simultaneously in a multiple display format such as split screen or quad screen based

Art Unit: 2613

upon the event (col. 4, lines 15-20), this suggests that multiple display formats would be in single image of full screen or a sub-sampled image as desirable.

Further, Johnson teaches the PIP (126 of fig. 3) is repeatedly displaying a sequence formed by a plurality of images from a buffer (131 of fig. 3), where the images of the sequence are provided to the display monitor repeatedly. Since Tapp suggests that the display (36) displays the multiple display formats for providing efficient monitoring of the zone of surveillance, and Johnson used the PIP (126 of fig. 3) for repeatedly displaying the image provided from the buffer B3, wherein the computer repeatedly provides an image signal to the PIP (126) to display the image. Tapp and Johnson both suggest the image signal that is captured by the camera to be displayed on the monitor display, so they are combination to make obvious the claimed invention. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over Tapp, Johnson, and combination of Tapp and Johnson.

In further response to applicant's argument, page 5 of the remarks, that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tapp and Johnson both suggest the monitor to display the image signal captured from the camera.

Art Unit: 2613

The obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in particular reference. In re Bozek, 416 F. 2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCAP 1969).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the previous Office Action, Paper No. 12.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-5874. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris. Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.


TUNG T. VO
PATENT EXAMINER

Tung T. Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2613

T.Vo
February 11, 2003